



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,194	12/20/2001	Bryan M. Elwood	87289.1741	5973
30734	7590	01/10/2006	EXAMINER	
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP WASHINGTON SQUARE, SUITE 1100 1050 CONNECTICUT AVE. N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036-5304			BHAT, ADITYA S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2863	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/022,194	ELWOOD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aditya S. Bhat	2863	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-16, 18-30 and 32-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-16, 18-30 and 32-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Regarding claims 2, 18, and 32 the phrase "such that" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 2-16, 18-30, and 32-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kail (USPN 5,959,529).

With regards to claim 2, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches a device that provides diagnostic and control capability for equipment from a remote location comprising:
an apparatus detached from the equipment comprising a display device, (34,54; See figure 1) an input device, (28;figure 1) software (82;figure 3) executed by the apparatus and a communications device; (16, 58;See figure 1) and
a hardware controller (22;figure 1) attached to the equipment to enable monitoring of the equipment by the apparatus through the communications device, wherein a unique identifier is stored on the controller, (Col.6, lines 20-21) the unique identifier is assembled using an array of data such that specific manufacturing configuration of the equipment are identified (Col. 3, lines 10-14)

With regards to claim 3, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the controller is queried by the apparatus. (Col. 8, lines 58-63)

With regards to claim 4, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the controller transmits data to the apparatus without being queried. (Col. 8, lines 58-67)

Art Unit: 2863

With regards to claim 5, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the data being transmitted is an indication detected by the controller of an equipment problem. (Col. 3, lines 22-32)

With regards to claim 6, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the controller transmits data in response to the query. (Col. 8, lines 58-63)

With regards to claim 7, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the controller is instructed by the software code to gather specific data about the equipment and transmitted to the apparatus. (Col. 2, lines 63-65)

With regards to claim 8, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the data is compiled by the software in a user-preferred manner. (Col. 2, lines 63-67) (Col. 2, lines 46-49)

With regards to claim 9, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the data is collected for a specific period of time after which time the data is lost and a new data collection period begins. (Col. 6, lines 60-63)

With regards to claim 10, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the data is available for review by a user on the apparatus during the specific period of time. (Col. 7, lines 16-18)

With regards to claim 11, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the software code is programmed with acceptable operational limits for the equipment associated with the identifier. (Col. 2, lines 63-67)

With regards to claim 12, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the limits are compared to the data retrieved from said controller, if results are within the acceptable operational limits the data no further action is taken, if results are not within acceptable said limits then apparatus carries out a predefined task. (Col. 3, lines 27-30)

With regards to claim 13, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the predetermined task is alerting the user as to the condition. (Col. 3, lines 30-43)

With regards to claim 14, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the predetermined task is alerting a technician as to the performance of the equipment (Col. 3, lines 40-43)

With regards to claim 15, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the predetermined task is transmitting data to the equipment to adjust certain operational features of the equipment. (364; figure 6)

With regards to claim 16, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the data is recorded and stored and available for review by the user. (Col. 5, lines 1-6)

With regards to claim 18, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches a method that provides remote diagnostic and control capability for equipment comprising:

monitoring the equipment through a hardware controller attached the equipment (Col. 4, lines 19-23) with a remote apparatus comprised of an input device, (28; figure 1) display device, (34, 54; See figure 1) a communications device (16, 58; See figure 1) and software code executed by the apparatus. (82; figure 3, Col. 7, lines 64-65)

storing a unique identifier on the controller that is attached to the equipment, (Col. 6, lines 20-21) the unique identifier is assembled using an array of data such that

Art Unit: 2863

specific manufacturing configurations of the equipment are identified (Col. 3, lines 10-14)

With regards to claim 19, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches selecting with the software code specific data collection wherein the software code records the data of pre-selected features of the equipment. (Col.2, lines 63-67)

With regards to claim 20, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches querying the controller with request for data, wherein the data is transmitted to the apparatus.(Col. 2-3, lines 67 & 1-4)

With regards to claim 21, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the step of responding and transmitting a response to the query. (Col.8, lines 58-64)

With regards to claim 22, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the step of compiling of the data by the apparatus and stored for a period of time. (Col. 8, lines 58-64)

With regards to claim 23, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches data collection is gathered for a fixed period of time after which the data is removed and a new data period is commenced. (Col. 6, lines 60-63)

With regards to claim 24, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the data is recorded and stored and available for review. (Col. 5, lines 2-3)

With regards to claim 25, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the step of comparing the data received from the controller with pre-selected limits, if the results of the comparison are outside of the acceptable limits then the apparatus proceeds with a predefined action; if the results of the comparison are with the acceptable limits then no further action is taken. (Col.2, lines 62-67)

With regards to claim 32, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches a device that provides remote diagnostic and control capability for equipment comprising:

remote means for monitoring the equipment the means for monitoring is an apparatus that is comprised of an input device, (28;figure 1) display device(34,54; See figure 1), a communications device (16, 58;See figure 1) and software coded executed by the apparatus (82;figure 3, Col. 7, lines 64-65) and

means for determining the status of the equipment through the means for monitoring, wherein the means for determining is a hardware device and is attached to the equipment and contains a unique identifier, (Col.4, lines 19-22) the unique identifier is assembled using an array of data such that specific manufacturing configurations of the equipment are identified (Col. 3, lines 10-14)

With regards to claim 33, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches a means for determining is a hardware controller. (22; Col.4, lines 19-22)

With regards to claim 34, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches means for selecting with software code specific data collection wherein the software code records the data of pre-selected features of the equipment. (Col.2 lines 63-67) (Col.3, lines 46-49)

Art Unit: 2863

With regards to claim 35, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches means for compiling the data from the equipment by querying the controller with request for data. (Col. 8, lines 58-64)

With regards to claim 36, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches data collection is gathered for a fixed period of time after which the data is removed and a new data period is commenced. (Col. 6, lines 55-59)

With regards to claim 37, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches the data is recorded and stored and available for review. (Col. 5, lines 2-3)

With regards to claim 38, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) teaches comparing the data received from the controller with pre-selected limits, if the results of the comparison are outside of the acceptable limits then the apparatus proceeds with a predefined action, if the results of the comparison are within the acceptable limits then no further action is taken. (Col.6, lines 60-64)

With regards to claim 26-30 and 39-43, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) shows various means of generating an alert (Col. 4, lines 48-53)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kail (USPN 5,959,529) in view of Harding (USPN 6,524,230)

With regards to claims 44-47, Kail (USPN 5,959,529) does not specifically disclose specific aspects of the equipment comprise a manufacturer, operating limits, serial number and feature of the equipment. Col.3, lines 11-13 broadly discloses the claim limitations of the above-mentioned claims.

Harding et al. specifically discloses specific aspects of the equipment comprises a manufacturer, operating limits, serial number and feature of the equipment. (Col. 30, lines 40-55)

Art Unit: 2863

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Kail invention to include the specific unique identifiers taught by Harding et al in order for a controller to collect and to store diagnostic information and to perform enhanced and automated packaging. (Col.2, lines 26-28)

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 19 October 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

While the meaning of claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allowed. This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification. In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In this instance applicant argues that the Kail (USPN 5,959,529) reference does not teach a unique identifier is assembled using an array of data such that specific manufacturing configurations of the equipment are identified (Col. 3, lines 10-14) .

The cited portion explicitly states " to uniquely identify each unit and the data relative to its configuration and use, to process the data received".

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chen et al. (USPUB 2004/0095237) teaches a electronic message delivery system in the monitoring and control of remote equipment and method of same.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aditya S Bhat whose telephone number is 571-272-2270. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on 571-272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aditya Bhat
January 4, 2006

BRYAN BUI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

